



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,679	08/19/2003	Kazuhiko Matsuno	32014-192254	3504
26694	7590	05/31/2007		
VENABLE LLP P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			EXAMINER TSEGAYE, SABA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/31/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/642,679

Applicant(s)

MATSUNO ET AL.

Examiner

Saba Tsegaye

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date, \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 10 and 11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

#### **Claim 1:**

Line 7, it is not clear whether “a transmission signal” refers to the same transmission signal cited in line 3.

Line 10, it is not clear whether “a spreading signal” refers to the same spreading signal cited in line 8.

Line 10, the phrase “the different period” lacks antecedent basis.

#### **Claim 8:**

Line 3, it is not clear whether “a spreading code” refers to the same transmission signal cited in claim 1, line 2.

Art Unit: 2616

Line 9, it is not clear whether “ a synchronization time slot” refers to the same transmission signal cited in claim 1, line 6.

Line, 17, it is not clear whether “ a transmission signal” refers to the same transmission signal cited in claim 1, line 3.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 5 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Senda (US 6,442,192) in view of Posner (US 6,677,817 US).

Claim 1, 5 and 6, Senda discloses a CDMA type multiple transmission apparatus comprising: spreading means (31-33) for employing a spreading code allocated for a self-channel to spread a transmission signal; power control means for increasing, until greater than an amplitude for the spreading signal, for outputting the resultant signal as a modulation signal and a multiplexer (as in claims 5 and 6) unit for superimposing modulation signals received from the CDMA transmitters (see figs 2-4).

Regarding claims 7- 9, Senda discloses receiving means for receiving the transmission signal transmitted by the transmitting means, demodulating the transmission signal and outputting a demodulated base band signal; and correcting means for comparing the base band signal output by the multiplexing means with the demodulated base band signal output by the

Art Unit: 2616

receiving means and correcting the base band signal output by the multiplexing means according to compared means.

However, Senda does not disclose a time slot having a predetermined cycle and having a different timing from that of a different channel.

Posner teaches a plurality of separate amplifier stages coupled between the amplifier input and amplifier output so as to cumulatively provide a desired amplifier gain to the input RF signal and a timing control circuit coupled to the plurality of separate amplifier stages for outputting the RF signal from the stages based on timing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a timing control circuit, such as that suggested by Posner, to the system of Send in order to allow a great number of simultaneous data transmission by assigning a specific timeslot for transmission.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 2-4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Porco et al. (US 2003/0179833 A1) discloses a method and apparatus for reducing transmitter peak power requirements using dual matrices.

Art Unit: 2616

Pinckley et al. (US 2003/0179829 A1) discloses a method and apparatus using base band transformation to improve transmitter performance.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saba Tsegaye whose telephone number is (571) 272-3091. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-5:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi H. Pham can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ST  
May 29, 2007

  
CHI PHAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
5/29/07